

## 8. Genesis

GENESIS DESCRIBES PICTORIALY THE UNNATURAL DEVELOPMENT OF A HAIR-COVERED APE INTO A NAKED HUMAN BEING BY MEANS OF CANNIBALISM. SEXUAL DESIRE LEADS HIM ASTRAY AND THE FRUIT OF KNOWLEDGE IS EATEN. KNOWLEDGE GROWS, BUT IN THE BRAIN THERE COME TO BE DELUSIONS WHICH CAUSE MAN TO SOLVE IMAGINARY MATERIAL TROUBLES BY MEANS OF AGONIZING WORK. THIS IS THE INHERITED CURSE WHICH BEARS DOWN ON ALL HIS DESCENDANTS. MAN WILL DEVASTATE THE EARTH AND DESTROY HIMSELF.

After I had recognized the truth concerning man's origin I hesitated to proclaim it. It is shattering and has immeasurable consequences for all spheres of human activity. The decision was made easier for me when I thought of the Genesis story in the Bible. For I saw that in these few pregnant lines the truth concerning the origin of mankind had already been told many thousands of years ago, but was no longer understood. What Genesis describes in images is totally in accordance with what I have apprehended.

Genesis is an intuitive description of the beginnings of life on earth, notably of the abnormal development of a hairy animal into man; who, by eating the fruit of knowledge, has become naked, sexually disordered and intelligent. As a result of this unnaturally acquired intelligence mental disorder developed and with it man's delusions, burdening him with the diseased concept of work and progress. With the aid of this intelligence he will devastate the earth, which in the end will bear only thorns and thistles, until in this desert he puts an end to his existence.

Genesis tells this story in a garbled picture language which is no longer understood today. In its original form Genesis is about 50,000 years old and was drawn up by the human

gods somewhere in the Mesopotamian cultural sphere shortly before man's mental breakdown became general. Thanks to their capacity for supersensory perception they were able to look back into a past in which as yet no man and no life existed on earth. But they could also look into a distant future in which there would no longer be any human beings on earth.

The mythological traditions of the ancient religions speak of these human gods, and they are mentioned in the writings of India, Egypt and Mesopotamia as well as elsewhere. What they said was in no way based on speculation or calculation, but on their supersensory perceptions, and it was therefore the truth, pure and simple.

When this mental disorder was becoming increasingly prevalent in Mesopotamia, languages were still very limited in vocabulary and generally inadequate, because man was only just beginning to speak in order to make up for his lost ability to communicate by thought. However, there was already a complicated picture script which could be understood and this the human gods used.

One can easily imagine the difficulty of expressing the so-called fall from grace in picture writing. But it is even more difficult to reproduce correctly in words. The authors of Genesis used everyday images for abstract concepts. They arranged the whole story like a play with lively dialogue to make it more comprehensible. In it, God walked through the garden and called to man who hid before Him. In reality of course God did not speak, for He was then dealing with what was still a hairy ape who did not speak, but like all apes communicated by thought transmission.

Genesis was still generally understood in early times when it was repeated orally and when it was later put down in picture writing. Its interpretation became more and more uncertain as the mental breakdown became prevalent, and there were no more human gods who could have recognized the truth and expounded Genesis correctly.

In the following thousands of years it was recounted innumerable times between the Nile and the Ganges and constantly set down anew in picture writing; in the course of all this new pictures inevitably cropped up, and the interpretation

of these diverged further and further from the original and nobody understood it correctly any more.

The oldest versions, and those approximating most nearly to the original, are still in Mesopotamia today, lying deep under the earth recorded in hieroglyphics on tablets of baked clay. They date from before the time of the Flood; frequent flooding has covered the oldest human culture with a layer of earth 250-400 feet thick. One day such tablets will be excavated and they will speak more clearly than the garbled fragments of the countless versions which have been passed down.

When the texts handed down to us were written, man's mental breakdown was already so far advanced that no one any longer considered possible what was recounted concerning him. The symbols were misunderstood as being concrete concepts and their real meaning was hardly perceived any more.

What man no longer understood he interpreted in his own favour, and where he found gaps he filled in the story with inventions of his own which allowed him to appear in a good light. For after losing all recollection of his previous existence, he made himself God's representative on earth and laid claim to a divine mission. His stricken brain in which subconscious recollections of his earlier god-like condition still existed led him astray in this respect.

Barely 3,000 years ago Moses and other Jewish philosophers selected the two least garbled Sumerian versions of the Genesis story, which are slightly different from one another. This is why the so-called Books of Moses contain two versions of the Genesis story which have since been adopted as an established constituent part of the Holy Scriptures. As—understandably—neither their origin nor their meaning was fully realized, they have been interpreted confusedly, and as philanthropically as possible. They were later linked with the national history of the Jews, without regard for the long time separating them from it.

Christians adopted Genesis into their Holy Scriptures along with the Books of Moses, thus it appeared in two versions in the Christian Bible too. When these were translated from Hebrew into many other languages, linguistic differences again resulted.

The current interpretation of Genesis is very arbitrary, extending into the realms of mystery although there is nothing mysterious in it. It is a concrete treatise. It becomes mysterious and incomprehensible only when theologians and scholars are resolved to distort the truth in such a way that a divine mission for man can be inferred, to justify his absurd and abnormal behaviour. Fundamentally this pleases man, and he is content to accept the flattering interpretation.

The first part of Genesis tells of the beginning of the earth itself and of life upon earth. After that darkness first reigned because the earth was veiled in vapours and gases. When the vapours dispersed the surface of the earth was covered with water, and the stars, the moon and the sun could be seen from the earth. Later, parts of the earth were raised by tectonic movements, and water and land were separated. The first continents came into being.

Life began in the water. Life forms evolved to become fish, later amphibians and birds, and finally animals which lived on the mainland which was already animated by vegetation. According to Genesis all this happened in six days.

The correct interpretation is simple up to this point. The six days were correctly interpreted as six epochs, and research, with the results of geological excavations and complicated technical aids at its disposal, has only been able to confirm that the origin of the earth and the sequence of events in the subsequent development of life must have occurred just as the first part of Genesis depicts them.

When Genesis first appeared neither spectral analysis nor instruments for determining the age of things and the order in which they came into being were known. At that epoch man could have made completely nonsensical assertions about the history of the earth; but the wise, gifted human gods did not lose themselves in fantastic conjectures, they told the truth.

Between the first part of Genesis and what modern science has established there are small discrepancies with regard to the sequence of the development of living creatures, but they are slight. It is not possible to establish whether they can be ascribed to the garbling of the original Genesis story. Moreover, it could well be that the results of modern research have to be revised, as has already frequently happened.

If the first part comes close to agreeing with the findings of modern research there is really no reason to doubt that the second part concerning man could also be true. In the first part the human gods have proved that they were no visionaries, but people who knew the truth. It is only a question of interpreting the second part correctly and so apprehending the truth. But this was difficult, because Genesis recounted strange things concerning man which he could neither understand nor believe. Thus it is written there:

'And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul. . . . And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.' 'And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman. . . . 'And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh. . . . 'Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh. And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed. . . . 'And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply. . . . Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat. . . . 'Now the serpent . . . said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden. But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods. . . . 'And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat. And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed the fig leaves together, and made

themselves aprons. And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day; and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God amongst the trees of the garden. And the Lord God called unto Adam, and said unto him, Where art thou? And he said, I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself. And he said, Who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat? And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest me to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat. And the Lord God said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat. And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed. . . . And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel. Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee. And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.'

. . . 'Unto Adam also and to his wife did the Lord God make coats of skins, and clothed them. And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever: Therefore, the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.'

Much that is written here concerning man is incompre-

hensible to him. His increasingly disordered mental state has made him more and more convinced of his divine calling, and he no longer deemed it possible that he came into being not according to God's will, but against God's will. It was he who had made himself, against all natural harmony.

The figurative way of telling the story, the exchange of words between God and man was too concrete and contradictory for man to understand. For it says there that God had forbidden man on pain of death to eat of the fruit of perception or of knowledge, which makes one clever. And the snake—which has always been the symbol for sexuality—persuaded man to eat of this forbidden fruit even so. The taking of this fruit is supposed to have been the original sin.

Man has always been subconsciously aware that there must be some such thing as an original sin at the bottom of his inner uncertainty, his self-doubt and of typically human sufferings. He suspected too that there was some connection between original sin and sexuality, for his sex life continually engendered in him a subconscious feeling of guilt, and a feeling of shame as well. The allusion in Genesis to the tempting words of the snake confirmed this suspicion.

But he rightly asked himself: Why should one's sex life, sexuality, be a sin, original sin itself even? And why should original sin be connected with the eating of a forbidden fruit which makes one clever? How can eating a fruit, i.e. a material substance, raise one's intelligence?

The theologians came to man's aid. They felt bound by reason of their profession to interpret Genesis, come what might, in such a way that man emerges from it as a being willed by God, having a divine mission, and alone entitled and able to recognize God and to rule the earth as God's favourite creature. They were able to get the better of this difficult task only with much courage, determination and falsification. Therefore at first they explained very vaguely that original sin was the first sexual intercourse between man and woman. According to this both sexes possessed their sexual organs only as a result of some divine error, for Genesis nowhere says that God created these organs later.

They affirmed too that man would have remained immortal

and lived eternally if the first human couple had simply not used their sexual parts.

This double misinterpretation on the part of the theologians did not work however; for anyone who gave the matter further thought could discover from Genesis itself that it had never been God's purpose to give man eternal life, quite the contrary: the tree of eternal life also stood in paradise and God's great concern was that man, who had already gained knowledge, might eat of its fruit and could then live for ever. That was why subsequently He banished man from the vicinity of this tree.

Sexual intercourse between the first human beings could not be a sin, and certainly not original sin, because this was the only possible way of multiplying, and God had indeed even told them that they should multiply. How can original sin be something which God Himself wished to happen? And why should sex be sinful at all? All living creatures have sex organs and all use them as man and his ape forbears have used them. If this were a sin, then God would have placed only sinful creatures in the world so that He could later punish them for their sins. What sort of mischief-making God have the theologians invented? And why does the sex act, the continuation of the supposed original sin, suddenly become God's will if it is performed after a church marriage ceremony?

Another riddle posed by Genesis was: God forbade man to eat the fruit of knowledge, i.e. a material substance, as man was not intended to become clever by means of it. He even threatened him, 'thou shalt surely die', if he should eat of this fruit. People ask justifiably: Why is intelligence, or knowledge, suddenly a sin?

Knowledge and intelligence are surely divine attributes. Why did God not want His 'image' to possess these attributes? All living creatures reach a certain level of intelligence according to their natural development. If intelligence is a sin, then lack of intelligence must be a virtue. Why then does God allow the animals to become steadily more intelligent in the course of millions of years of natural development?

Even the theologians perceived that cleverness cannot be a sin and rightly explained that man's sin was to want to be as

clever as God, and this displeased God. But how he wanted to attain this special cleverness, what it had to do with eating any material substance, and what the role of the sex symbol, the snake, was in all this the theologians have to date been unable to say. This however is the crux of the question, and at the same time Genesis' greatest riddle: What has becoming intelligent got to do with eating a material substance? Is there any such thing as a fruit of knowledge?

The theologians found no explanation for this problem. They could not know that there is indeed a material substance, a fruit of knowledge, the eating of which can make man clever, indeed even naked. If instead of theologians the chieftain Umkulunkulu or other cannibals in Borneo had been asked about this, then they would have given a prompt and correct answer to this point from Genesis. More, they would even have been able to explain why the snake, the symbol of sexuality, had incited man to eat the fruit of knowledge, and still does today where cannibalism is practised.

But no one took the trouble to consult the cannibals and as usual the settling of this question was frivolously left to the 'experts'. And the theologians' theory is as follows: God did not really prohibit eating any material thing, any fruit of knowledge, for there is no material thing the eating of which makes one clever. God issued a veto of a purely abstract nature, because he wanted to test man. Nobody knows the purport of this veto—so the theologians say—perhaps it was merely directed against evil human thoughts. According to this explanation original sin consists in this: man thought an evil thought; from this, not only did he become clever, but at a later stage naked too—what a powerful thought. *What* he ought not to have thought, however, God did not tell him: man was supposed to find that out for himself. For God knows everything, but one thing He does not know: whether man will guess what he is not supposed to think.

Thus Genesis was declared to be wrong at the very place where it did not fit in with theology. According to theology there is no fruit of knowledge making one clever and naked, as God said, but only some evil thought or other which gives rise to all these phenomena.

A hundred years ago people at least still took the trouble

to consider what the fruit of knowledge might be. Man imagined among other things an apple, for example, which theologians at that time had no objection to. Today people prefer to impute a falsehood to God, so as to seem more 'progressive'.

Therefore we can reject the theological interpretation of the Genesis story with a quiet conscience, especially the most 'modern' one, which reveals itself more and more as the most flagrant misinterpretation. Genesis speaks very clearly to those who still think with their own brains and do not allow themselves to be manipulated.

Genesis shows the first people before their fall from grace, therefore before cannibalism. It places them in a fertile, green garden, which indicates that at that time there was no drought and no desert there.

Genesis specifically mentions that man as a breed or species came into being at the end of the act of creation. All breeds of animal, thus also the ancestors of man from whom he developed, were already in existence. In one version of Genesis it is also indicated that man lived in peace with other animals to start with, which means that he was not carnivorous, but vegetarian. This becomes still clearer when God says to man that he has given him all kinds of plants and fruit-bearing trees so that he may eat of them. There is not a word about animals.

The first human beings, whom the Bible names Adam and Eve, stand symbolically for the human species and are not individual people.

According to Genesis God created man from dust, by which it is meant that he is of earthly origin and that his body was taken from the earth. Genesis nowhere says that this is not the case with other animals.

This is stressed in the case of man because at the time when this was recorded mankind, as a result of the onset of mental disorder, had already lost all recollection of their origin and because of their delusions attributed an extra-terrestrial, heavenly origin to themselves.

According to Genesis God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life. This 'breath of life' is the immaterial cosmic energy of life, the existence of which has been known for several tens of thousands of years and, as already explained,

no living creature can live without this cosmic energy. The independent life of a newly born infant does not begin with its first breath of air, but when it takes in prana through its nostrils for the first time.

Genesis does not say that the only being to be dependent on this breath of life was man, while other creatures were not, and it also clearly expresses the fact that this 'breath of life' was neither of earthly origin nor of a material nature. But it does say that after this 'breath of life' man 'became a living soul'. From this it follows that the breath of life or prana is not the same thing as the soul. The cosmic life energy is half-spirit, while the soul is spirit. But it is not said either that other creatures do not have a soul, or that God has given a soul only to human beings. On the contrary, the self-same Bible elsewhere says that animals too received a soul from God.

Man is described in Genesis as an unclothed creature originally needing no artificially produced clothes; he had his own natural covering of hair. Artificial clothing made from animal skins became necessary only later, not because the climate had changed, but because man had eaten the forbidden fruit of knowledge and had therefore become naked.

According to Genesis God decided to give the male Adam a wife. While Adam 'slept' he took one of his ribs and made Eve from it.

This part of Genesis was never correctly understood either. If God was able to form Adam from the dust of the ground without using the bones of any other creature for this purpose, then he should surely have been capable of creating Eve in the same way. Why did he need a bone to do this, and why specifically Adam's rib? And not a bone from his finger?

This mysterious-sounding metaphorical tale is not, however, so mysterious. Genesis says merely that Adam became 'one flesh' with Eve through 'sleep' and that Adam thus forwent one set of ribs.

As already explained the human race is a cross-bred race. It came into being by the crossing of a male African ape—Adam—with thirteen pairs of ribs, and a female Asian ape—Eve—with only twelve pairs of ribs. This crossing produced the human race, with only twelve pairs of ribs.

Thus Adam's race did in fact lose a pair of ribs through this interbreeding. The expression 'one flesh' stands for the result of the crossing between the two breeds of ape.

But because one of the founders of this new hybrid race had thirteen ribs, human beings are still born today who have thirteen pairs of ribs or the degenerate traces of a thirteenth pair. Unless things had happened in the way described this atavistic throwback would not be possible.

All this can still be inferred today from the structure of the human skeleton.

If scholars had discovered such an irregularity in a present-day breed of ape or other species of animal they would at once have taken it as certain that this must be an atavistic throwback resulting from cross-breeding. But as they came across this oddity in man, they firmly closed their scholarly eyes.

It is also understandable that the loss of the ribs was connected with the word sleep, for sexual association is still described today in all parts of the earth and in all languages as sleeping, or sleeping together, although every language has other words for mating as well. It was the same 50,000 years ago too when Genesis was recorded in picture writing.

Adam was very astonished at the outcome of this 'sleep', and exclaimed: 'This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh'. He could say this with complete assurance, although God had not cut any piece of his flesh out; for he saw a hybrid, a new creature which resembled him certainly, but was identical neither with him nor with his mate; and the descendants of this hybrid later called themselves *Homo sapiens*. As already mentioned, the outcome of this crossing was a male animal which was accepted neither by its father's breed nor its mother's. This cross-breed had to leave both breeds and found a new breed, in a manner of speaking, by mating with the female animals of the two ancestral breeds.

Genesis clearly expresses this too when it is said:

'Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh.' By 'a man' is meant this first male hybrid which, no longer identical with the breed of his father or his mother, leaves them and founds—by interbreeding with females of the ancestral breeds, and of other breeds too—a completely

new breed. And so it came to pass: not only this first hybrid, but also all his descendants, did 'cleave unto' women, i.e. the females of the paternal and maternal ancestral breeds and of other breeds too, and begot more and more new cross-breeds by them. And this was inevitably so, for a thoroughbred breed of ape certainly does not seek sexual association with a hybrid breed, as that is contrary to their age-old instinct. In addition to all this, the members of the new hybrid breed were cannibals. It was therefore quite out of the question that a male ape of a non-cannibal breed would look for a mate in a group of cannibal apes. It is not the male hominoid apes that fertilized the females of the cannibals, but the male cannibals who found themselves mates among the females of the ancestral breeds.

The expression to 'become one flesh' does not generally mean sexual intercourse and in this case it does not mean that at all. Sexuality has been the common property of all living creatures, including all apes inside their own breed, since the beginning of life on earth. Thus Genesis did not have to mention this as a new phenomenon. By 'become one flesh' is meant that from two breeds of ape a new hybrid race will be formed, Adam's very experience when he exclaimed: 'This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh'. From this 'becoming one flesh' and from 'leaving father and mother and cleaving unto one's wife' there developed a continual process of metamorphosis from ape into human being.

It was God's will, as Genesis records, that this process should be pursued in a peaceful way, not by force and in conjunction with cannibalism. But his plan later foundered on the unnatural deeds of man.

God expressly wished fruitfulness upon this new race, for under normal circumstances hybrids are not able to beget children. Therefore Genesis quite clearly says, not without reason, that the fruitfulness and multiplication of this new race of hybrids became possible only as a result of God's wish and contrivance, namely by means of special genes which made this process possible at all.

Nor is there any suggestion that multiplication should take place without sexuality, for God created male and female to that end.

Up to that point everything remained within the confines of cosmic order and God even blessed the first parents of mankind; because it was intended that a splendid creature should develop from the crossing of breeds and attain an especially high and healthy intelligence with god-like capabilities, in the confines of natural development over a long period. All indications for this were there. Genesis expresses this in saying that God had created man in 'his own image'.

It was a fine plan, but things happened differently. Not because God had altered his plans, but because man acted against God's plan. He did not want to wait the many millions of years which would have been necessary in the course of natural development to become a 'god' of the planet earth, like those 'gods' that are on other planets. He wanted to achieve everything quickly and in so doing circumvent God. He ate the intelligence drug, and by mean of it became certainly intelligent, but later mentally deranged as well.

In Genesis God forbade man to eat the fruit of the tree of awareness, lest he, or his species, 'surely die'. In some versions this tree is called the 'tree of the fruit of knowledge' and the fruit is called the 'fruit of knowledge'. The death of which warning is given is called in some translations the 'death of death'.

But the snake seduced man by saying: 'Ye shall not surely die: For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.'

From most ancient times the snake has been the symbol for sexuality. Snakes are still eaten today in China and other parts of Asia to evoke sexual vitality. In less than two hours this drug takes effect by generally warming up the body, and strengthened sexual impulses follow this. As sexual vitality also indicates health, the snake is still today the professional sign of medical men and apothecaries.

The snake, which stands for sexuality in Genesis too, was straight away able to promise man higher intelligence if he ate of the fruit of knowledge because God had said of this fruit that it does make one clever.

Thus Genesis expresses quite clearly two things which no theologian can deny: (1) the fruit of the tree of knowledge was



a material substance which makes one clever, and (2) the motives which seduced man into eating this material thing were of a sexual nature. And something else becomes completely clear in Genesis: eating this fruit was the original sin itself.

God did not forbid man to say, think or see this or that, no more did he forbid him to go to anywhere or to make anything: He only forbade man to partake of a specific material substance which makes one clever.

But up until now the clear statement of Genesis was not understood because it was simply not considered possible that there was in this world a material substance the eating of which makes one clever.

The confusion was further increased because it was in fact the snake, the symbol of sexuality, that incited man to eat the substance which made one wise.

Thus Genesis explains original sin unequivocally as this: man in his desire for pleasurable sexual feelings ate a substance which increased his sexual impulses and at the same time made him more intelligent.

Intelligence in itself is not primarily a sin, it all depends how one acquires it. But it can be acquired contrary to the natural order and God warns man of this in Genesis.

The raw brain of one's own species is that so 'puzzling' material that contains knowledge and thinking ability and the eating of which increases the intelligence of the person eating it.

As Genesis describes it, first the Asian species, which is symbolized by Eve, ate this forbidden fruit. Cannibalism thus began in Asia and it is there too, in Mesopotamia on the border between Asia and Africa, that the new hybrid race of man came into being. The first cannibals therefore were apes of the breed of Eve. In Adam's breed in Africa this process did not become widespread until later for climatic reasons. The somewhat smaller brain sizes of some African races show this.

After man had eaten the fruit of knowledge, he hid himself. His bad conscience tormented him, for he, a vegetarian animal, had killed a completely innocent creature of his own kind, not to quiet his hunger and not in self-defence, but merely in order to increase his sexual impulses.

Every animal, the ape especially, knows exactly when it is offending against the universal order. One can observe in domestic animals that they too can suffer from conscience, pangs of conscience and even a feeling of guilt.

Later God called out to man and asked where he was. Adam answered that he had hidden because he was afraid, and he was ashamed because he had become naked. According to Genesis God did not need to ponder long concerning the reasons why he had become naked, for He knew, if man had become naked, he must have eaten of the forbidden fruit of knowledge. For He said: 'Who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat?'

The hairy creature which was man had lost his coat of hair upon eating the material substance which makes people clever, not upon thinking evil. Genesis does not say that God first caught man in the act of eating the forbidden fruit, and then made him naked as a punishment. This loss occurred as an automatic consequence of eating the forbidden fruit of knowledge. Eating brain upset the functions of the pituitary gland, as already mentioned, and thereby affected hair-growth and the sexual life. Eve, who in this context should be taken to mean the Asian breed, admitted that she had been the first to eat of the fruit. But she asserted that she had been tempted by the snake, in other words by sexuality.

In Genesis man plaited an apron for himself from the leaves of plants after his fall from grace, and covered his sexual parts with it. This did not occur without reason: he was strengthening his sexual powers by eating brain and was no longer using his sex organs only for propagation, but principally in order to experience immoderate sensations of sexual pleasure. As he was able to do this only by murdering his fellow men, a feeling not only of guilt but of shame too developed in him.

Later God gave clothes made from skins to the now naked man, i.e. man was forced to kill animals—which he did not do before—in order to clothe himself with their hides because he was freezing. He began to eat animal meat too for the same reasons, so as to get warm by means of its higher calory content, although God created 'fruit and plants of every kind' for him that he might eat them.



The Books of Moses, which contain Genesis, and many other myths indicate that God later forbade meat-eating, or ordained its restriction, because this type of food operated very negatively on the vegetarian creature that man was. From this there developed, all over the world and among all races, rules prescribing fasts and the partial or total repudiation of meat-eating.

Thus it can clearly be inferred from Genesis that man was a hairy animal, and that he had lost his own coat of hair as a consequence of cannibalism and was forced to clothe himself with the skins of other animals.

In Genesis God also told man of further consequences of eating the fruit of knowledge. Abnormalities were to occur in his sexual life and his mental condition. First God declared that He would put enmity between the snake and the woman and between the descendants of both, and that in woman a desire for man would come into being. The snake was to creep upon the earth after the woman and bruise her heel.

Only a few people know that a female animal lives completely without sexual desires and that these arise solely and exclusively during the period when she is ready to conceive. Nor does a female animal have feelings of pleasure during copulation of the type or degree experienced by a woman; for as a result of cannibalism the female sex of the human species lost not only the signs of being ready to conceive, as has already been mentioned, but also the purposive arrangement whereby sexual desire occurred only during this period. In addition to this, women developed a heightened sensation of pleasure during copulation. Sexual desire or readiness for sexual intercourse can occur or be aroused in woman at any time. A female ape cannot be seduced, but a woman can. This sexual desire for man is the snake which can bruise woman's heels at any time.

But what does this 'bruising' by the snake consist of? A woman does not know whether or not she will have a child after sexual intercourse, because she lacks the perceptible signs indicating the period where she is ready to conceive. This made the birth-rate impossible to control.

In addition to this, woman's fertility rose steeply as a result

of cannibalism; she can bring as many as twenty children into the world.

In spite of the disappearance of the sex signs men have been sleeping with women more than ever since that time, for if they were to wait for the appearance of these signs human beings would be extinct within a few decades. The typically human phenomenon, love, arose from this disorder of the hormones. The loss of control over births together with the constant readiness and desire for sexual intercourse will have bitter consequences in the very near future: the overpopulation of the earth.

Man can do as little to remedy this as he can to remedy his disordered brain. Therefore he will give way more and more to his urge for sex, just as he will use the diseased surfeit of intelligence in his brain for increasingly misanthropic and destructive purposes. That is part of the curse which weighs on him as a result of original sin, and of its own accord it is accelerating and unfolding inexorably.

Genesis mentions too that the descendants of woman will bruise the head of the snake. Some theologians interpret this as if God in his anger had proclaimed to sinning humankind a message of joy, in that he held out the prospect of a redeemer who would take all their sins upon himself and kill the snake for ever. This interpretation is wishful thinking. God was cursing man, why should he put a plum in with his curse? Now the snake is the symbol, not only of sexuality, but also of cleverness. Genesis itself describes the snake as the most sly and cunning animal on earth.

The head of the clever snake, that is its intelligence, was to be bruised by the cannibals' descendants, and indeed it has been trampled on. As a result of cannibalism intelligence was thrown into complete confusion. Man with his unsound mind allows himself more and more to be swept into actions which are hostile to mankind, and which inevitably push him towards catastrophe.

God further proclaimed that woman would bring her children into the world with great pain. This is understandable, for intelligence and sexuality are related, and this is equally true of the feelings of pleasure and pain which are linked with the

sex life. The more intelligent a creature is, the more these feelings come to the forefront, but not in the absolute sense: in the case of natural development not only the intelligence develops, but at the same time the whole physical structure of the creature, so that sensitivity to feelings of pain and pleasure remains at a level bearable for that creature. But in the case of man intelligence was substantially increased by cannibalism, while his physical properties have remained almost the same. The high level of sensitivity is thus in keeping with the high intelligence, but the appropriate physical development, which should keep the feelings of pain and pleasure associated with sex within bearable bounds, is lacking. Women consequently cry out in childbirth because of the pain, and often at the moment of orgasm, on account of the feeling of pleasure—a phenomenon unknown in the animal world. There are besides other physical and spiritual reasons why human females have such severe labour pains, but they too have their origin in cannibalism.

In Genesis, however, God also proclaimed to the originally polygamous ape that his sexual freedom was at an end. He said to the woman that from now on the man would be her master, which he had not been previously. And this happened too. The institution of marriage had to be introduced to restrict quarrelling among the men over women.

God's most momentous proclamation, however, was that man, who had become cleverer by eating the fruit of knowledge, would be no happier as a result of it. Quite the contrary: he would be the only creature on earth to have to sustain his existence amid sorrow and toil, and to *eat his bread in the sweat of his face*.

This too has come to pass, not because the earth has ceased to be fertile, but because man fell victim to his delusions. These have been constantly increasing since his mental breakdown, and the measures he took against them also became more and more numerous and complicated. In other words the curse of work developed as so-called progress. Man does not eat more than he did a million years ago, but he works incomparably harder for the same amount of food. This change did not take place overnight, but in a process which began slowly

and has been increasing at an accelerated rate; it is far from being at an end, because man's insanity too is still increasing at an accelerated rate. Man's capacity for philosophical thought is disappearing and he pursues his suicidal game with matter, which for him has become the only perceptible substance. If he had achieved nothing in doing so it would be lucky for him, but he has made a slave of himself and embittered his own life in the process. And yet he maintains that one day human happiness will come from his material progress, although to date exactly the opposite has resulted: a justified fear of the future and increasing misery throughout the earth. As animals do not imitate this progress, they are free of its consequences, and are therefore able to live with their still sound intelligence as free of work and fear as three thousand million years ago.

The barren earth foretold by God, bringing forth only thorns and thistles, is not yet universally to be found. But man has spent the past 50,000 years systematically changing this planet into an uninhabitable wasteland, and at an accelerating rate. The destruction and devastation of the earth did not begin, however, only with present-day 'progress'. There has been 'progress' for 50,000 years, only at the beginning it was smaller and developed hesitatingly, and consequently the process of devastation on earth proceeded more slowly. And man was formerly able to permit himself the luxury of turning the countryside into wasteland if he felt so inclined, for population figures were low.

These comparatively harmless misdemeanours were no more painful than a few mosquito bites would be to an elephant. But today this same elephant is covered over and over again with mosquitoes which are multiplying with terrifying speed. Thanks to 'progress' they no longer bite only with their stings, they use every conceivable means of 'science'.

Uncontrollable population growth and increasing insanity are thus ensuring that this prophecy of God's is fulfilled: devastation of the earth by man himself, who all the time affirms that he is fulfilling a divine mission on earth with all his works. Or as he puts it today: he is making use of opportunities such as have never existed before to build a golden future for himself.

But God also said that on the day he eats of the fruit of knowledge man will 'surely die' or, as it is expressed elsewhere, in other versions of Genesis, 'die the death' or 'die the death of death'. But he has not died, he has even multiplied irresistibly. Did God lie or did he exaggerate his threat? Or did the 'human gods' who recorded only truths in Genesis make a mistake?

No such thing occurred. Death and die are two words which mean the same thing. If the death of an individual was meant, one of the two words would have sufficed. To die the death of death means the extinction of the species. Thus the original picture writing is expressing here the idea of a 'twofold' death: the death of the individual and the death of the species.

If God said that this would happen 'on the day' of the original sin, this should be taken to mean that the cause leading to the 'death of death' came into being on the day on which man ate brain for the first time. Thus the punishment is implicit in the sin itself. If this were not to be understood thus, then God's wits must have been wandering, for he foretold pain and suffering for all the descendants of the cannibals. Consequently the death of death cannot be an immediate punishment, because it is a known fact that dead men do not beget children.

What was to come to pass up to now, according to Genesis, has happened word for word; and what still remains outstanding will come to pass in exactly the same way, not through some future act of punishment on God's part, but as an inevitable result of original sin. The human species in its mental darkness will inevitably lay waste the earth with its progress, and in the end the earth will bring forth only thorns and thistles, and man will have to die his 'death of death' on his self-made desert.

This is what Genesis says, and it is anything but a message of joy for the creature that wanted, by eating concentrated intelligence, to become wise like God quickly, and became a fool in the process.

Man is particularly proud of one sentence in Genesis and prints these words in heavy type so as to call special attention

to them: 'God created man in his own image'. Genesis expresses clearly by this that it was God's plan to allow a splendid creature to develop from this cross-breeding, alone of its kind, between two breeds of ape; in the course of thousands of millions of years in the confines of a natural development this should have attained a god-like degree of intelligence. Thus the prospects for this ideal crossing of breeds were the best possible on this earth. In other words, there would have been on earth too beings of god-like, high intelligence such as exist on many other planets, communicating telepathically with similarly very intelligent beings throughout the universe. These are the so-called mortal gods with whom, shortly before the onset of insanity, man too was able to communicate.

But this hybrid race gambled away its opportunities by original sin. It did not await its natural development, but tried, behind God's back so to speak and against all the rules of natural order, to become as wise as God through cannibalism. It wanted to attain in a short space of time, i.e. in one million years, what it would not have attained through natural development even in twenty million years. It is true that man obtained his enormously high intelligence and was already able to communicate telepathically with extra-terrestrial beings of high intelligence, but this intelligence became crippled by insanity. The species lost its god-like capabilities.

Thus originated that madman of genius who has been convinced from that time on of his resemblance to God, and who will not perceive that he has frustrated God's plan and wrecked his own chances. He wilfully overlooks this in Genesis too, and only reads from it what God meant to make out of him.

This was done especially by the theologians who in doing so explained the clear words of God as they felt inclined, if that suited their book. Especially in our own day, man uses his pretended resemblance to God as a justification for all the criminal deeds he commits against his own kind and Nature.

Anyone who still feels doubt concerning the true causes of man's origin and the correct interpretation of Genesis will be wondering: Was this 'fruit of knowledge' which made man clever and naked really the brain of his fellows or was it some

fruit or other from some tree or other which stood in the 'middle of the garden'?

It would be unreasonable to take this metaphorical representation in Genesis literally. Such a tree, with fruit that was sexually stimulating and caused nakedness and cleverness, did not exist. If there had been such a tree, then not only man's forbears but also all other breeds of ape would have made use of its fruit and would likewise have become intelligent, naked and sexually disordered.

Certainly there are and were plants which increase sexuality and also affect the intellect temporarily. As already described such a plant, 'saladjin', is still eaten as a sex drug by apes in Asia today. Certainly these and several other plants were eaten by apes in earlier times too for the same reason. But no breed of ape became naked and clever through eating them.

Did perhaps only one certain breed of ape eat a miraculous plant and in so doing become naked, intelligent and human beings? This possibility is excluded too because the great variety of human races which exist today proves that mankind did not develop from one breed of ape, but from more than a hundred different ones.

But why search so feverishly for a miraculous plant which does not exist when countless skulls subjected to cannibalism are lying under the ground to speak for themselves?

The fruit of the tree of knowledge which caused cleverness and nakedness is the human brain and nothing else. And the unending succession of skulls left by cannibals proves that this fruit of knowledge was consumed without interruption by the forbears of *Homo sapiens* for a million years.

But why does Genesis not say unambiguously that the fruit of knowledge is the brain? The original version of Genesis was recorded in picture writing when there was as yet no language, and consequently no word for brain could exist. It was thus unavoidable that the story should be expressed pictorially. And: what is the brain if not the fruit of knowledge? It could be so called still today.

But how does the tree come into Genesis?

Only a person who has ever tried to decipher an old picture script knows how difficult it is to distinguish between the

hieroglyph for a tree and that for a man. Often it is even impossible. For how was a man represented in picture writing, and how is he still represented today by some tribes of negroes or by the primitive forest races of the Amazon? At the upper end of a vertical line there is a circle representing the head. At the lower end of the line two spreading lines are put on as legs, and between them hangs the male sexual organ, often reaching almost to the ground. Is it a man, or a tree with roots bearing some fruit? It can mean either, and the meaning of this symbol at any given time can be inferred only from its context. It was even almost inevitable that man after his mental breakdown should take the symbol indicating a man in Genesis for that of a tree; for he could no longer conceive that human development could have anything to do with eating brain.

Thus it was entirely possible for him that the symbol for a man could be that for a tree, with its roots in the ground. And the head was the forbidden fruit of knowledge through eating which one can become wise. In New Guinea, for example, the same hieroglyph can mean 'man' or 'tree' and must be interpreted as one or the other according to context. This is a well known fact which has often been published.

A 'man of learning' defending the theory of natural evolution could now protest: if men had developed as a result of eating brain, then this would necessarily be known to them still today, for this knowledge would certainly have been handed down from generation to generation.

But what was to be transmitted if mankind had, as already described, forgotten its past history and the whole process of human development? Do we know perhaps that man used to be a hairy ape which did not walk upright and that he lost his own coat of hair? Whatever reasons it can produce for the lack of such orally transmitted traditions, science must nonetheless admit that at some point of time man did lose recollection of his past. Only they will hardly be ready to admit the reason for it: insanity and its causes.

Certainly man continued to practise cannibalism sporadically after the onset of insanity and right up to the present day, and its motives have remained the same: he wanted to produce feelings of sexual pleasure, higher fertility and higher

intelligence. His conscious and subconscious memories of the advantages of eating brain led him to do this.

We today know that cannibalism is a sin just as well as the first man, who hid himself after eating the first 'fruit of knowledge', knew it. But if cannibalism was practised so generally by all races on all continents, why then are there no pictures carved in stone concerning it? Since the Stone Age man has made records of what he did and what he experienced. Hunting, war, marriage, and indeed even sexual intercourse were recorded in stone and clay. Why did he not depict cannibalism? From the very beginning this deed was regarded as the greatest sin, and always remained a secret and a taboo.

It is true that a few pictures are known dating from pre-historic times which suggest cannibalism. But nowhere has a picture been preserved on which a man is attacking a skull as a cannibal, scratching out the brain and eating it. However, it is not impossible that such secret pictures might still be found.

Those races which are still cannibal today and are in part at the Stone Age level of development also engage in artistic activities and record many things in stone, wood and clay; but they never depict cannibalism. And if they speak about cannibalism they refer to this deed by such coded expressions as 'touching the flesh' and 'taking the fruit'; and it is striking that the brain in this case is sometimes called 'the fruit' and sometimes 'the flower'.

Cannibalism is a taboo for them even today, and is bound up with a feeling of guilt. Consequently it is carried out only in groups so that the guilt is shared among them, and for the same reasons it is linked with a ritual ceremony, whatever the circumstances.

Among some primitive peoples still practising cannibalism the young men are kept confined to a hut for several days for their 'initiation', they are visited only by the medicine man of the tribe and given instruction on 'secret lore'. In fact these huts are high schools teaching biology at which among other things they are taught in detail about the secret knowledge concerning the effects of eating brain, including 'how' and 'when' to eat it, and ordered to preserve the strictest silence

concerning it, under threat of a curse. This is another reason for the obstinate silence of the cannibals as to the purpose of their practices. But it does not free them of their subconscious feelings of guilt.

This inherited subconscious feeling of guilt forbade man to depict cannibalism, and the same subconscious feeling of guilt also hinders scholars from examining connections between cannibalism and the origin of man. The same applies to the improper interpretation of Genesis.

The true reasons for human development and the correct interpretation of Genesis will, however, have a decisive influence on man's way of thinking and the goals he sets himself in the future. The theologians will be most obdurate in resisting this truth, for they made Genesis, as they interpreted it, one of the foundations of their religion, and credited man with a divine mission which does not exist. This applies to the approximately twelve million Jews and approximately one thousand million Christians.

When the true reasons for human development are generally accepted, and the new interpretation of Genesis too, the churches will have no option but to make their position clear. If they stick to their version they must count on being forsaken by their adherents. But if they were to accept the truth, this would mean the ruin of the churches. Of the church's teachings, only the incontrovertible philosophical truths of general validity spoken by barefoot itinerant preachers like Buddha or Jesus will remain, men who started up spiritual movements in the world, but who did not create the organized churches and their dogmas.

Paradoxically, the principle of cannibalism cannot be as clearly distinguished in the teachings of any religion in the world as it can in that very Christian religion which must most sharply reject human development from cannibalism on 'religious' grounds. At the so-called 'sacramental supper', also called 'communion', bread and wine are transformed into the flesh and blood of Christ. Spiritual advantages are supposed to accrue from eating these material substances. This ritual is moreover connected with the concept of repentance and the feeling of guilt, and it is even practised collectively.

Man's subconscious recollections of cannibalism and how it

works are so deeply anchored in him, and even today have such a powerful effect, that they influence him in every sphere of activity and thought without his knowledge. Love, war, and religion are no exceptions to this.

As Genesis, correctly interpreted, is the only incontrovertible description of man's origin, it should be made available to all peoples as mankind's most precious possession. It ought not to remain the exclusive possession of those very people who have falsified it. For not only does it document the past, it also describes the painful future of the human species.

The so-called Books of Moses also describe mankind's 'confusion' when the large lingam which went down into history as the 'Tower of Babel' was being built. This event too is an important part of the history of the development of the human species. By eating the fruit which made him wise he became enormously intelligent and thought he had already achieved the resemblance to God he longed for. In fact he was already able to communicate telepathically with extra-terrestrial mortal 'gods', in other words intelligent beings from other planets. In the same way he was able to perceive cosmic truths of the greatest importance, which no other living creature on earth was able to do. He already felt himself to be a god. As a symbol of his victory he chose the male sexual member and raised enormous lingams which towered into the sky. The 'Tower of Babel' was to be the greatest lingam of all time.

This premature victorious elation ended in a shattering defeat, however. For man this involved, as well as the loss of his ability to communicate with his fellow man by means of thought and of all his powers of extra-sensory perception, the disordering of his brain. On account of his increasing hallucinations, this led him—among other things—even to begin working and he has been earning his daily bread in the sweat of his face ever since that time.

But he did not learn anything from this. The spirit of the cunning snake drove him on. When he had lost his sight into the immaterial world and matter remained for him the only perceptible substance, he began 50,000 years ago to play a dangerous game with it, and has been doing so since with increasing intensity and accelerating speed. This he calls

progress. All his deeds, however, are no more than the avoidance, speeding up or alteration of processes which ought to occur naturally in the confines of divine order. In other words: he is once again giving God the slip, this time on the material level. So he has not changed. He wants to move quicker than Nature has made provision for. He is artificially increasing the fertility of the earth because Nature, as created by God, is not good enough for him. He artificially raises and alters the nutritional value of produce and eats it in the form of artificially manufactured concentrates. He even intervenes in the biological processes of his own body because he wants to 'improve' himself. He unleashes enormous energies on the planet earth which should not be unleashed, and limits those which he ought not to limit. He is thereby disturbing the equilibrium of those cosmic forces which ought to guarantee the continuation of life on the planet earth.

Thousands of gigantic chimneys tower into the sky emitting noxious smoke—these are *his new lingams* with which he proclaims his 'victory' over 'inadequate' Nature and her creator: 'See, I am as God. Behold my progress.' His new human gods are the so-called scientists. They set in train processes which are contrary to Nature, and man takes these as the fulfilment of his supposed divine mission.

It is indeed a mission, not a divine one, however, but a diabolic one.

If there is such a thing as a divine mission at all, then it is fulfilled by the animals and plants which are totally part of the cosmic order and manage without 'progress'.

'God's favourite creature' will become aware in the not too distant future that he cannot continue his crimes with impunity. But then it will be too late, and the sand of the self-made deserts which Genesis predicted to him will already be grating in his teeth.

This is the story of Genesis and it is no fairy story; nor does it give the theologians cause to interpret it as a message of joy for mankind.